

Applicants: SOMMER et al.  
Serial No. 10/646,899  
Response to Final Office Action of January 3, 2006  
Page 10

### **REMARKS**

#### **I. Rejections under 35 USC §102**

Claims 1-6 and 8 -13 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Publication US2005/0033371 to Sommer et al. ("Sommer").

Claims 1-3, 6, 8 and 12-13 are also rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Publication US2004/0260355 to Holleman et al. ("Holleman").

Sommer discloses a connector sleeve that serves to adapt a non-standard pacing lead connector having a conductive connector element 25 to a pulse generator connector. The lead adapter sleeve has a conductive element 104 and a proximal connector pin 102, which are configured to present a standard pacing lead connector. The pacing lead connector snaps into the connector sleeve by reason of a lever retention element 35 within the lumen of the sleeve that engages an edge 250 on the pacing lead connector. Sommer teaches nothing more than an adapter having a snap-in retainer to hold a pacing lead connector.

Claims 1 and 12 are directed to providing an adaptor for a lead having an array of electrodes from which one or more electrodes may be selected to optimize electrical stimulation therapy. The adaptor permits selective connection of lead connector pads coupled to individual electrodes of the electrode array to the connector header contacts of a device. Each of claims 1 and 12 specify (a) a lead connector that includes an array of individual, circumferentially distributed lead connector pads and (b) an electrical contact flange that extends through an insulating adaptor body into a lumen, wherein the flange is dimensioned to be in registration with one of the individual, circumferentially distributed lead connector pads when the lead connector is inserted into the lumen of the adaptor body and is rotated relative to the adaptor body thereby to selectively engage any one of the plurality of lead connector pads when the lead connector is disposed within

Applicants: SOMMER et al.  
Serial No. 10/646,899  
Response to Final Office Action of January 3, 2006  
Page 11

the inner lumen and the adapter body is rotated about longitudinal axis extending from the proximal end to the distal end of the adapter.

Fundamentally, Sommer fails to disclose a connector system for a lead having an array of electrodes from which one or more electrodes may be selected to optimize electrical stimulation therapy. Further, Sommer shows a connector adaptor that even if rotated relative to the lead adaptor does not provide for registration of a contact element on the adaptor with one of a plurality of lead connector pads. Thus, Sommer fails to disclose or suggest either feature (a) or (b) above. As such, Sommer fails to anticipate the pending claims.

Holleman teaches an adapter that couples multiple high-voltage connector elements included on a plurality of medical electrical lead connectors to a single connector port to facilitate alternative high-voltage vectors. Holleman does not teach or suggest a connector system for a lead having an array of electrodes from which one or more electrodes may be selected to optimize electrical stimulation therapy. Further, Holleman shows a connector adaptor that even if rotated relative to the lead adaptor does not provide for registration of a contact element on the adaptor with one of a plurality of lead connector pads. Thus, Holleman fails to disclose or suggest either feature (a) or (b) above. As such, Holleman fails to anticipate the pending claims.

## **II. Rejections under 35 USC §103**

Claims 1-3, 6, 8 and 12-13 are alternatively rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holleman in view of US 4,469,104 to Peers-Trevarton ("Peers-Trevarton"). However, nowhere in the office action is there any argument that applies the specific combination of references other than in regard to claims 9-11. The indication is that Holleman is applied in the same manner as in the anticipation rejection. The above remarks regarding the insufficiency of Holleman to provide various limitations of the claims are hereby adopted in response to the obviousness rejection based on the combination of Holleman

Applicants: SOMMER et al.  
Serial No. 10/646,899  
Response to Final Office Action of January 3, 2006  
Page 12

and Peers-Trevarton. Further, Peers-Trevarton merely teaches a connector assembly with spaced apart metal bands. Peers-Trevarton fails to provide any relevant teachings in regard to a connector system wherein a lead connector has an array of lead connector pads that are distributed circumferentially around the lead connector in an adjacent spaced apart relationship. The combination of Holleman and Peers-Trevarton fails to render obvious the subject matter of claims 1-3, 6, 8 and 12-13 or claims 9-11.

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holleman in view of US Patent No. 5,843,141 to Bischoff et al. ("Bischoff"). Holleman is applied in the same manner as in the anticipation rejection. The above remarks regarding the insufficiency of Holleman to provide various limitations of the claims are hereby adopted in response to the obviousness rejection based on the combination of Holleman and Bischoff. Bischoff teaches a pulling tool for pulling a lead connector assembly proximally in a bore of a connector block from a first position in which the lead's connector assembly is not fully inserted in the connector block to a second position in which said connector assembly is fully inserted in the connector block, the pulling tool being provided with a mechanical connector which engages with mechanical connector on the lead's connector assembly. The combination of Holleman and Bischoff fails to render obvious the subject matter of claims 4 and 5.

Applicants: SOMMER et al.  
Serial No. 10/646,899  
Response to Final Office Action of January 3, 2006  
Page 13

### III. Conclusion

Holleman, Bischoff and Peers-Trevarton, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the subject matter as a whole of claims 1 and 12 and the claims dependent thereon. Based upon the amendments to the claims and the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a notice of allowance be issued in due course.

Date: March 21 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Michael C. Soldner

Reg. 41,455

Telephone: (763) 514-4842

Customer No. 27581